arXiv:1702.07698v1 [math.DS] 24 Feb 2017

Complexity and fractal dimensions for infinite sequences with positive entropy

Christian Mauduit
Université d'Aix-Marseille et Institut Universitaire de France
Institut de Mathématiques de Marseille, UMR 7373 CNRS,
163, avenue de Luminy, 13288 Marseille Cedex 9, France

Carlos Gustavo Moreira
Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada
Estrada Dona Castorina 110
22460-320 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Abstract: The complexity function of an infinite word w on a finite alphabet A is the sequence counting, for each non-negative n, the number of words of length n on the alphabet A that are factors of the infinite word w. One of the goals of this work is to estimate the number of words of length n on the alphabet A that are factors of an infinite word w with a complexity function bounded by a given function f with exponential growth. We describe the combinatorial structure of such sets of infinite words and we introduce a real parameter, the *word entropy* $E_W(f)$ associated to a given function f. We give estimates on the word entropy $E_W(f)$ in terms of the exponential rate of growth of f and we determine fractal dimensions of sets of infinite sequences with complexity function bounded by f in terms of its word entropy.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 68R15, 37B10, 37B40, 28A78.

Keywords: combinatorics on words, symbolic dynamics, fractal dimensions, entropy.

1 Introduction and notations

We denote by q a fixed integer greater or equal to 2, by A the finite alphabet $A = \{0, 1, \ldots, q-1\}$, by $A^* = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} A^k$ the set of finite words on the alphabet A and by $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ the

set of infinite words (or infinite sequences of letters) on the alphabet A. More generally, if $\Sigma \subset A^*$, we denote by $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ the set of infinite words obtained by concatenating elements of Σ. If $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ we denote by $L(w)$ the set of finite factors of w:

$$L(w) = \{v \in A^*,\ \exists\,(v', v'') \in A^* \times A^{\mathbb{N}},\ w = v'vv''\}$$

and, for any non-negative integer n, we write $L_n(w) = L(w) \cap A^n$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that $v \in L_n(w)$ is a special factor (of length n) of w if v is prefix of more than one word in $L_{n+1}(w)$.

If $w \in A^k, k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $|w| = k$ the length of the word w and if S is a finite set, we denote by $|S|$ the number of elements of S. If x is a real number, we denote $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \leq x\}, \lceil x \rceil = \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z}, x \leq n\}$ and $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$.

We will use at several stage the following classical lemma concerning sub-additive sequences due to Fekete [Fek23]:

Lemma 1.1. *If $(a_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence of real numbers such that $a_{n+n'} \leq a_n + a_{n'}$ for any positive integers n and n', then the sequence $\left(\frac{a_n}{n}\right)_{n\geq 1}$ converges to $\inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{a_n}{n}$.*

Definition 1.2. The *complexity function* of $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ is defined for any non-negative integer n by $p_w(n) = |L_n(w)|$.

The complexity function gives information about the statistical properties of an infinite sequence of letters. In this sense, it constitutes one possible way to measure the random behaviour of an infinite sequence: see [Que87, PF02] and [MS97, MS98] for connections between measure of normality and other measures of pseudorandomness. Obviously, we have $1 \leq p_w(n) \leq q^n$ for any non-negative integer n and it is easy to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 1.3. *For any $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ we have $L_{n+n'}(w) \subset L_n(w)L_{n'}(w)$ and $p_w(n + n') \leq p_w(n)p_w(n')$.*

Lemmas 1.1 and 1.3 have two important consequences that we will use several times:

Consequence 1: For any $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$, the sequence $\left(\frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n)\right)_{n\geq 1}$ converges to $\inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n)$.

Consequence 2: If there exist a real number λ_0 ($1 \leq \lambda_0 \leq q$) and an integer n_0 such that $p_w(n_0) < \lambda_0^{n_0}$, then $p_w(n) = O(\lambda^n)$ for some $\lambda < \lambda_0$.

If we denote

$$E(w) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_w(n),$$

it can be shown (see for example [Kůr03]) that $E(w)$ is equal to $h_{top}(X(w), T)$, the topological entropy of the symbolic dynamical system $(X(w), T)$ where T is the one-sided shift on $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $X = \overline{orb_T(w)}$ is the closure of the orbit of w under the action of T in $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ ($A^{\mathbb{N}}$ is equipped with the product topology of the discrete topology on A, i.e. the topology induced by the distance $d(w, w') = \exp(-\min\{n \in \mathbb{N} |\, w_n \neq w'_n\}))$.

To each $x \in [0, 1]$ we associate the infinite word

$$w(x) = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_n \cdots$$

on the alphabet A, where $x = \sum_{n\geq 0} \frac{w_n}{q^{n+1}}$ is the representation in base q of the real number x (when x is a q-adic rational number, we choose for x the infinite word ending with 0^∞). It is well known since E. Borel [Bor09] that almost every real number x is normal in base q (i.e, for any positive integer n, each one of the q^n possible words of length n on the alphabet $\{0, 1, \cdots, q-1\}$ occurs in the q-adic expansion of x with the same frequency $\frac{1}{q^n}$). In particular, for almost every $x \in [0, 1]$ we have $p_{w(x)} = q^n$ for any $n \geq 0$.

2 Definitions and results

Our work concerns the study of infinite sequences w the complexity function of which is bounded by a given function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$. More precisely, if f is such a function, we denote

$$W(f) = \{w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}, p_w(n) \leq f(n), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_n(f) = \bigcup_{w\in W(f)} L_n(w)$$

and we define the notions of exponential rate of growth, w-entropy (or word-entropy) and w-complexity (or word complexity) of f as follow :

Definition 2.1. If f is a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, we call *exponential rate of growth* of f the quantity

$$E_0(f) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf \frac{1}{n} \log f(n)$$

and *w-entropy* (or *word entropy*) of f the quantity

$$E_W(f) = \sup_{w\in W(f)} E(w).$$

Definition 2.2. If f is a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, we call *w-complexity* (or *word complexity*) of f the function P_f defined, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by

$$P_f(n) = \max\{p_w(n), w \in W(f)\}.$$

Our previous papers [MM10] and [MM12] concern the case $E_0(f) = 0$ and in this paper we will consider the case of positive entropy.

In Sections 3 and 4 we will give upper bounds and lower bounds for $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$ in term of $E_0(f)$ and $E_W(f)$. We will show (Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.7), that for any given function f, we have

$$\exp(E_W(f)n) \leq |\mathcal{L}_n(f)| \leq \exp(E_0(f)n + o(n))$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{L}_n(f)| = E_W(f)$$

(the fact that this limit exists is a consequence of the fact that for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ we have $\mathcal{L}_{n+n'}(f) \subset \mathcal{L}_n(f)\mathcal{L}_{n'}(f)$ and Lemma 1.1 applied to $a_n = \log |\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$). We will show (Theorem 4.6) that the w-entropy of a function f is equal to the exponential rate of growth of its w-complexity: $E_W(f) = E_0(P_f)$ and we will end Section 4 by showing that the w-entropy of f allows to compute exactly the fractal dimensions of the sets

$$C(f) = \{x = \sum_{n\geq 0} \frac{w_n}{q^{n+1}} \in [0, 1], w(x) = w_0w_1 \cdots w_n \cdots \in W(f)\} \tag{1}$$

of real numbers $x \in [0, 1]$ the $q-$adic expansion of which has a complexity function bounded by f (Theorem 4.9).

The second part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the w-entropy E_W and its relations with the exponential rate of growth E_0. Infinite words

whose complexity function has an exponential grow but low initial values play a special role in this study and we define the following important class of infinite words on the alphabet $\{0,1\}$:

Definition 2.3. We say that $w \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a *pre-sturmian* infinite word of order k if w is not ultimately periodic and if, for any non-negative integer $n \leq k$, we have $p_w(n) = n+1$.

Remark 2.4. It follows from a classical result due to Coven and Hedlund ([CH73]) that non ultimately periodic infinite words w with lowest possible complexity function p_w are the ones for which $p_w(n) = n+1$ for any non-negative integer n. Such infinite words, called sturmian words, have been extensively studied since their introduction by Hedlund and Morse in [HM38] and [HM40] (see [Lot02, chapter 2] and [PF02, Chapter 6] for very good surveys on sturmian words). It follows from Definition 2.3 that a sturmian word is a pre-sturmian word of any order.

It is easy to give examples of function f for which the ratio $E_W(f)/E_0(f)$ can be made arbitrarily small. In Section 5 we show that, even under stronger conditions concerning the function f, it might happen that $E_W(f) < E_0(f)$. On the other hand, we will show in Section 6 that if f satisfies a quite natural condition $(\mathcal{C}^*)$ introduced in Section 5, we always have

$$E_W(f)/E_0(f) > \frac{1}{2}$$

(Theorem 6.2) and that $\frac{1}{2}$ is the best possible constant (Theorem 6.7). The proof of Theorem 6.7 is based on a renormalization theorem concerning pre-sturmian infinite words (Theorem 6.6).

Theorem 7.1, shows that, for any $h \in (0,+\infty)$, there is an infinite word w on a finite alphabet with at least $\lceil e^h \rceil$ letters such that the complexity function p_w has exponential order h (in the sense that there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $c_1 e^{hn} \leq p_w(n) \leq c_2 e^{hn}$). This theorem and Corollary 7.3 can be compared with the result obtained by Grillenberger in [Gri73] showing that, for any $0 < h < \log q$, there exists a strictly ergodic $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $E(w) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_w(n) = h$.

In Section 8 we discuss an open problem concerning the w-entropy of the minimum of two functions.

Remark 2.5. It might be difficult to compute the w-entropy of a given function and it would be interesting to provide an algorithm allowing to estimate with an arbitrary precision the w-entropy of any given function satisfying the conditions $(\mathcal{C}^*)$.

3 Upper bounds for $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$

The first idea in order to obtain upper bounds for $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$ is to follow the strategy presented in [MM10]: for any integers k and N we have by Lemma 1.3

$$\mathcal{L}_{kN}(f) = \bigcup_{w\in W(f)} L_{kN}(w) \subset \bigcup_{w\in W(f)} L_N^k(w).$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}\bigcup_{w\in W(f)} L_N^k(w) = \bigcup_{w\in A^{\mathbb{N}}|L_n(w)|\leq f(n),\forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}} L_N^k(w) &\subset \bigcup_{\substack{w\in A^{\mathbb{N}}\\ |L_N(w)|\leq f(N)}} L_N^k(w)\\ &\subset \bigcup_{\substack{S\subset A^N\\ |S|\leq f(N)}} S^k = \bigcup_{\substack{S\subset A^N\\ |S|=\max\{\lfloor f(N)\rfloor, q^N\}}} S^k,\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$|\mathcal{L}_{kN}(f)| \leq \sum_{\substack{S\subset A^N\\ |S|=\max\{\lfloor f(N)\rfloor, q^N\}}} \lfloor f(N)\rfloor^k = \lfloor f(N)\rfloor^k \binom{q^N}{\max\{\lfloor f(N)\rfloor, q^N\}} \leq f(N)^k q^{Nf(N)}.$$

Now we choose the parameter k in order to optimize this upper bound. Let us fix an increasing sequence of positive integers $(N_r)_{r\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \log f(N_r)/N_r = E_0(f)$$

and, for $q^{q^{N_r}} \leq n < q^{q^{N_r+1}}$, take $k = \lceil \frac{n}{N_r} \rceil$ in the above estimate. It follows that

$$|\mathcal{L}_n(f)| \leq |\mathcal{L}_{kN_r}(f)| \leq f(N_r)^k q^{N_r f(N_r)} = e^{\varphi(n)},$$

where $\varphi(n) = k\log f(N_r) + N_r f(N_r)\log q$ satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\varphi(n) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{N_r}\log f(N_r) = E_0(f).$$

Remark 3.1. Clearly, we can replace in this estimate the function $q^{q^{N_r}}$ by other unbounded increasing functions, with arbitrarily fast growth at infinity.

Finally, we have proved the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2. *For any function f, we have*

$$|\mathcal{L}_n(f)| \leq \exp(nE_0(f) + o(n)).$$

Example 3.3. For each $1 < \theta \leq q$, and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta^{n_0+1} > n_0 + q - 1$, we define the function f by $f(1) = q$, $f(n) = n + q - 1$ for $1 \leq n \leq n_0$ and $f(n) = \theta^n$ for $n > n_0$. We have $E_0(f) = \log \theta$ and $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)| \leq \theta^{n+O((\log_q n)^{\log_q \theta} \log_q \log_q n)}$.

4 Lower bounds for $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$ and fractal dimensions of $C(f)$

We will now give lower bounds for $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$ in term of the w-entropy $E_W(f)$ and show that $E_W(f)$ allows to compute exactly the fractal dimensions of the set $C(f)$ defined by (1) (see [Fal90, Chapters 2 and 3] for basic definitions concerning fractal dimensions and [Bug04, Chapters V and VI] for other examples of application of fractal dimensions to number theoretical problems).

4.1 A lemma concerning fractal dimensions

Definition 4.1. We call *block interval* any interval of a decomposition of $[0, 1]$ as the union of q^n intervals of size $1/q^n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (block intervals correspond to cylinders, i.e., to fixing the beginning of infinite sequence).

Let ψ be the shift map on the interval $[0, 1]$, defined by $\psi(x) := \{qx\} = qx - \lfloor qx \rfloor$. Then, we have the following lemma concerning the fractal dimensions of ψ-invariant compacts of $[0, 1]$:

Lemma 4.2. *If $X \subset [0, 1]$ is a compact set such that $\psi(X) \subset X$ with upper box dimension equal to s, the the Hausdorff measure of dimension s of X is greater or equal to $q^{-s}/2$ (or infinite). In particular, the upper box and Hausdorff dimensions of X coincides.*

Proof. If X had Hausdorff measure of dimension s smaller than $q^{-s}/2$, since X is compact, it would be possible to cover X by a finite number of open intervals $\tilde{I}_j (1 \leq j \leq m)$ with

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} |\tilde{I}_j|^s < q^{-s}/2.$$

Each interval $\tilde{I}_j$ can be covered by two block intervals with disjoint interiors, say I_{2j-1} and I_{2j} with $|I_{2j-1}|, |I_{2j}| < q|\tilde{I}_j|$, so it is possible to cover X by the block intervals with disjoint interiors $I_j (1 \leq j \leq 2m)$ of sizes $1/q^{r_j} (1 \leq j \leq 2m)$ with

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2m} (1/q^{r_j})^s < 2 \cdot q^s \cdot q^{-s}/2 = 1.$$

This would imply that X is contained in the maximal invariant set K of the expanding map $\varphi : \cup_{j=1}^{m} I_j \to [0,1]$ given by $\varphi \mid_{I_j} := \psi^{r_j}$. But the upper box and the Hausdorff dimensions of K are both equal to λ, where λ is the root of the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} (1/q^{r_j})^\lambda = 1$$

(see [PT92, Chapter 4], in which upper box dimension is called limit capacity) and, since $\sum_{j=1}^{m} (1/q^{r_j})^s < 1$, we would have $\lambda < s$, which would contradict our hypothesis.

□

The following corollary follows from the proof of Lemma 4.2:

Corollary 4.3. *For any $x \in [0,1]$, the closure of the orbit of x under the shift map ψ has positive Hausdorff measure of dimension $E(w(x))/\log q$.*

4.2 The w-complexity of a function

If f is a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, let P_f be the w-complexity of f defined in Definition 2.2. It is easy to check that for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ we have $P_f(n + n') \leq P_f(n) P_f(n')$ and it follows from Lemma 1.1 applied to $a_n = \log P_f(n)$ that the sequence $\left(\frac{1}{n} \log P_f(n)\right)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \log P_f(n)$, so that we have

$$E_0(P_f) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_f(n) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \log P_f(n).$$

Theorem 4.6 will show that we have $E_W(f) = E_0(P_f)$. We begin by proving the following important lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *For any function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, there exists $w \in W(f)$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $p_w(n) \geq \exp(E_0(P_f)n)$.*

Proof. Let us prove Lemma 4.4 by contradiction and suppose that, for any $w \in W(f)$, there exists a positive integer n such that $p_w(n) < \exp(E_0(P_f)n)$. By Consequence 2 of Lemma 1.3, this would imply that, for any $w \in W(f)$

$$E(w) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_w(n) < E_0(P_f).$$

Let us choose $\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E(w) < \frac{\tilde{m}}{\tilde{m}+1} E_0(P_f)$ and

$$M = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} p_w(n) \exp\left(-\frac{\tilde{m}}{\tilde{m}+1} E_0(P_f)n\right) < +\infty.$$

It follows that for $m = \max(\tilde{m}, M)$ we would have

$$p_w(n) \leq m. \exp\left(\frac{m}{m+1} E_0(P_f)n\right),$$

so that we would have

$$W(f) \subset \cup_{m \geq 1} W(g_m),$$

where g_m is defined by

$$g_m(n) = m. \exp\left(\frac{m}{m+1} E_0(P_f)n\right)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This would imply that the set $C(f)$ defined by (1) would satisfy $C(f) \subset \cup_{m \geq 1} C(g_m)$.

By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(|\mathcal{L}_n(g_m)|) \leq E_0(g_m) = \frac{m}{m+1} E_0(P_f) < E_0(P_f),$$

so that the upper box dimension of $C(g_m)$ would be at most

$$\frac{m}{m+1} c/\log q < c/\log q$$

since, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $C(g_m)$ could be covered by $|\mathcal{L}_n(g_m)|$ intervals of size $1/q^n$. In particular, the Hausdorff measure of dimension $E_0(P_f)/\log q$ of $C(g_m)$ would be 0, and

thus the Hausdorff measure of dimension $E_0(P_f)/\log q$ of $C(f) \subset \cup_{m\geq 1} C(g_m)$ would be also 0. By applying Lemma 4.2 to $X = C(f)$, this would imply that the upper box dimension of $C(f)$ is strictly smaller than $E_0(P_f)/\log q$, which would be a contradiction.

□

Remark 4.5. In Part 8 we will give an effective version of Lemma 4.4 (see Lemma 8.3).

Theorem 4.6. *For any function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, we have $E_W(f) = E_0(P_f)$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.4 that there exists $w \in W(f)$ such that for any integer $n \geq 1$ we have $\frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n) \geq E_0(P_f)$, so that

$$E_W(f) = \sup_{w\in W(f)} E(w) \geq E_0(P_f).$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $w \in W(f)$ such that

$$\inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n) > E_W(f) - \varepsilon,$$

so that for any integer $n \geq 1$ we have $p_w(n) > \exp((E_W(f) - \varepsilon)n)$. This implies that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$P_f(n) = \max\{p_w(n), w \in W(f)\} > \exp((E_W(f) - \varepsilon)n)$$

so that we have $P_f(n) \geq \exp(E_W(f)n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular,

$$E_0(P_f) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log P_f(n)}{n} \geq E_W(f)$$

and it follows that $E_W(f) = E_0(P_f)$.

□

4.3 Lower bounds and rate of growth of $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$

We are now able to prove the following theorem :

Theorem 4.7. *For any function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$,*

(i) there exists $w \in W(f)$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $p_w(n) \geq \exp(E_W(f)n)$;

(ii) for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)| \geq \exp(E_W(f)n)$;

(iii) $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|) = E_W(f)$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 4.6 that there exists $w \in W(f)$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $p_w(n) \geq \exp(E_0(P_f)n) = \exp(E_W(f)n)$, which proves (i). As we have $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)| \geq p_w(n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it proves also (ii). On the other hand, for any $w \in W(f)$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$p_w(n) \leq \max\{p_w(n), w \in W(f)\} = P_f(n) \leq f(n),$$

which implies that $W(f)$ coincides with $W(P_f)$. This is enough to prove (iii) since, by (ii), Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.6 we have

$$E_W(f) \leq \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(P_f)|) \leq E_0(P_f) = E_W(f).$$

□

4.4 Fractal dimensions of $C(f)$

Given a function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, let $C(f)$ be the set defined by (1) of real numbers $x \in [0,1]$ the $q-$adic expansion of which has a complexity function bounded by f.

Theorem 4.8.
The Hausdorff dimension of $C(f)$ is equal to $E_W(f)/\log q$. More precisely, the upper box dimension of $C(f)$ is equal to $E_W(f)/\log q$ and the Hausdorff measure of dimension $E_W(f)/\log q$ of $C(f)$ is positive (or infinite). Moreover, there exists $x \in C(f)$ such that the closure of the orbit of x by the map ψ has positive (or infinite) Hausdorff measure of dimension $E_W(f)/\log q$.

Proof. The fact that the upper box dimension of $C(f)$ is at most $E_W(f)/\log q$ follows from the estimate $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|) = E_W(f)$ since, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $C(f)$ can be covered by $|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|$ intervals of size $1/q^n$.

On the other hand, let us consider $w \in W(f)$ such that $p_w(n) \geq \exp(E_W(f)n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in [0,1]$ such that $w(x) = w$. If X is the closure of the orbit of x, X is invariant by ψ and intersects at least $\exp(E_W(f)n)$ intervals of the usual decomposition of $[0,1]$ as the union of q^n intervals of size $1/q^n$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that the upper box dimension of X is at least $E_W(f)/\log q$ and finally is equal to $E_W(f)/\log q$. Theorem 4.8 follows by applying Lemma 4.2 to $X = C(f)$.

□

5 Relations between the exponential rate of growth and the w-entropy of a function

5.1 An example of function f such that $E_W(f)/E_0(f)$ can be arbitraly small

If f is the function defined in Example 3.3, we have $E_0(f) = \log\theta$. But if $w \in W(f)$, we have $p_w(n) = n + q - 1$ for $1 \leq n \leq n_0$, which implies by Lemma 1.3 that

$$p_w(n) \leq p_w(n_0\lceil n/n_0\rceil) \leq (p_w(n_0))^{\lceil n/n_0\rceil} \leq (n_0 + q - 1)^{\lceil n/n_0\rceil}$$

for any $n > n_0$ and it follows that $W(f)$ is contained in $W(g)$, where $g(n) = n+q-1$ for $1 \leq n \leq n_0$ and $g(n) = (n_0 + q - 1)^{\lceil n/n_0\rceil}$ for $n > n_0$.

This shows, by Theorem 4.7 and Theorem 3.2, that we have

$$E_W(f) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|) \leq \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(g)|) \leq E_0(g) = \frac{1}{n_0}\log(n_0 + q - 1),$$

where $\frac{1}{n_0}\log(n_0 + q - 1)$ can be made arbitrarily small, independently of θ.

5.2 The conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ and an open problem

We always have $E_W(f) \leq E_0(f)$ and we saw in Part 5.1 that we may have $E_W(f) < E_0(f)$ and even $E_W(f)$ arbitrarily small independently of $E_0(f)$. On the other hand, if f is indeed a complexity function (i.e. $f = p_w$ for some $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$), then we clearly have $E_W(f) = E_0(f)$. But the following problem seems difficult to handle:

Problem 5.1. Find a set of simple conditions on f which hold for complexity functions and imply $E_W(f) = E_0(f)$.

We will now suppose that functions f satisfy the quite natural conditions $(\mathcal{C}^*)$ which hold for all unbounded complexity functions.

Definition 5.2. We say that a function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies the conditions $(\mathcal{C}^*)$ if

i) for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f(n+1) > f(n) \geq n+1$;

ii) for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ we have $f(n+n') \leq f(n)f(n')$.

Remark 5.3. If there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(n) \leq n$, then f is ultimately periodic and $W(f)$ is finite.

Remark 5.4. Given any function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that $f(n) \geq n+1$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it is possible to construct recursively a non increasing integer valued function $\tilde{f}$ satisfying the condition $(\mathcal{C}^*(ii))$ and a real valued function $\tilde{\tilde{f}}$ satisfying the conditions $(\mathcal{C}^*)$ such that $W(f) = W(\tilde{f}) = W(\tilde{\tilde{f}})$ and such that $E_0(f) > 0$ implies $E_0(\tilde{f}) = E_0(\tilde{\tilde{f}}) > 0$. For example, we can take $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{f}}$ defined by $\tilde{f}(0) = 1$, $\tilde{f}(1) = \lfloor f(1) \rfloor$ and, for any integer $n \geq 2$,

$$\tilde{f}(n) = \min\{\inf_{k \geq n} \lfloor f(k) \rfloor, \min_{1 \leq k < n} \tilde{f}(k)\tilde{f}(n-k)\}$$

and, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{\tilde{f}}(n) = \tilde{f}(n) + \frac{n}{n+1}.$$

Lemma 5.5. *If a function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies the conditions $(\mathcal{C}^*)$ then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f(n) \geq \max\{n+1, \exp(E_0(f)n)\}$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma 1.1 applied to $a_n = \log f(n)$.

□

If $\theta^{n_0} > n_0 + q - 1$, the example presented in Section 5.1 does not satisfy the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ nor the weaker condition mentioned in Lemma 5.5. In Section 5.3 and Section 5.5 we give two examples which show that, even under these stronger conditions, we do not always have $E_W(f) = E_0(f)$.

5.3 An example of function f satisfying $(\mathcal{C}*)$ but such that $E_W(f) < E_0(f)$

Let f be the function defined by $f(n) = \lceil 3^{n/2} \rceil$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it is easy to check that f satisfies conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ and that $E_0(f) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log f(n) = \log(\sqrt{3})$.

On the other hand, we have $f(1) = 2$, so that $|A| = 2$. If $a \in A$, we denote $\bar{a}$ the other element of A. We will show that the condition $f(2) = 3$ implies that $E_W(f) \leq \log(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}) < E_0(f)$. Indeed, given $w \in W(f)$, since $f(2) = 3$, there is $(a_1, a_2) \in A^2$ such that $a_1 a_2 \notin L_2(w)$. It follows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$L_{n+2}(w) \subset L_{n+1}(w)a_2 \cup L_{n+1}(w)\bar{a}_2 = L_n(w)\bar{a}_1 a_2 \cup L_{n+1}(w)\bar{a}_2,$$

which implies $p_w(n+2) \leq p_w(n+1)+p_w(n)$. So it follows by induction that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $p_w(n) \leq F_{n+2}$, where $(F_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the Fibonacci sequence, defined by $F_0 = 0, F_1 = 1$ and $F_{n+2} = F_{n+1} + F_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$E_W(f) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_w(n) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log F_{n+2} = \log(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}).$$

For almost any infinite words w on the alphabet $A = \{0, 1\}$ without the factor 11 we have $p_w(n) = F_{n+2}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that we have proved that for this example, we have

$$E_W(f) = \log(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}) < \log(\sqrt{3}) = E_0(f).$$

5.4 Cassaigne conditions

Cassaigne defined and studied in his thesis [Cas94] (see also [Cas96] and [Cas97]) the function s_w counting the number of special factors of a given infinite word w. If, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $s_w(n)$ the number of special factors of length n of w, it follows from his study that for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ we have the general inequality

$$s_w(n + n') \leq p_w(n)s_w(n').$$

If $p_w(1) = 2$ then we have for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s_w(n) = p_w(n + 1) - p_w(n)$, so that the previous inequality becomes

$$p_w(n + n' + 1) - p_w(n + n') \leq p_w(n)(p_w(n' + 1) - p_w(n')) \text{ for any } (n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2,$$

which may be stronger than the inequality $p_w(n + n') \leq p_w(n)p_w(n')$. In despite of that, we have the following example in the case $\lfloor f(1) \rfloor = 2$ which shows that, even if we add to the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ the *Cassaigne condition*

$$f(n + n' + 1) - f(n + n') \leq f(n)(f(n' + 1) - f(n')) \text{ for any } (n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2, \tag{2}$$

we may have $E_W(f)$ strictly smaller than $E_0(f)$.

5.5 An example of function f satisfying $(\mathcal{C}*)$ and Cassaigne conditions but such that $E_W(f) < E_0(f)$

Let f be given by $f(0) = 1, f(1) = 2, f(2) = 4$ and $f(n) = f(n - 1) + 3f(n - 3)$ for any $n \geq 3$. We claim that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have :

(H_k) For any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $n' \leq k$, we have $f(n+n') \leq f(n)f(n')$.

It is easy to check that (H_1) is true by induction on n : we have $f(n+1) \leq 2f(n)$ for $n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and if we suppose that for $n \geq 2$ we have $f(n-1) \leq 2f(n-2)$ and $f(n+1) \leq 2f(n)$, then $f(n+2) = f(n+1) + 3f(n-1) \leq 2f(n) + 6f(n-2) = 2f(n+1)$. It follows from (H_1) that (H_2) is also true : $f(n+2) \leq 4f(n)$.

Then the proof of (H_k) follows easily by induction on k : if we suppose that (H_k) is true for $k-2$ and k $(k \geq 2)$, then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f(n+k+1) = f(n+k) + 3f(n+k-2) \leq f(n)f(k) + 3f(n)f(k-2) = f(n)f(k+1)$, so that (H_{k+1}) is true.

As (H_k) is true for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that f satisfies the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ and morevover satisfies the Cassaigne condition (2) which is equivalent in this example to the inequality $f(n+1) \leq 2f(n)$ for $n' = 0$, to the inequality $f(n+2) - f(n+1) \leq 2f(n)$ for $n' = 1$ and to the inequality $f(n+n'-2) \leq f(n)f(n'-2)$ for $n' \geq 2$.

If α denote the real root belonging to $(1, +\infty)$ of the polynomial $p(x) = x^3 - x^2 - 3$ (notice that $p(1) = -3 < 0$, $p(2) = 1 > 0$ and $p(x)$ is increasing on $[1, +\infty)$, so that $1 < \alpha < 2$), we have $E_0(f) = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log f(n) = \log \alpha$.

On the other hand, we have $f(1) = 2$, so that $|A| = 2$. If $a \in A$, we denote again $\bar{a}$ the other element of A. Given $w \in W(f)$, since $f(3) = 7$, there is $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in A^3$ such that $a_1a_2a_3 \notin L_3(w)$. It follows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n+3}(w) &\subset L_{n+2}(w)a_3 \cup L_{n+2}(w)\bar{a}_3 \\ &\subset L_{n+1}(w)a_2a_3 \cup L_{n+1}(w)\bar{a}_2a_3 \cup L_{n+2}(w)\bar{a}_3 \\ &= L_n(w)\bar{a}_1a_2a_3 \cup L_{n+1}(w)\bar{a}_2a_3 \cup L_{n+2}(w)\bar{a}_3, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $p_w(n+3) \leq p_w(n+2) + p_w(n+1) + p_w(n)$. So it follows by induction that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $p_w(n) \leq T_{n+2}$, where $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the Tribonacci sequence, defined by $T_0 = 0, T_1 = 1, T_2 = 1$ and $T_{n+3} = T_{n+2} + T_{n+1} + T_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$E_W(f) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_w(n) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log T_{n+2} = \log \beta,$$

where $\beta = \frac{\sqrt[3]{19+3\sqrt{33}} + \sqrt[3]{19-3\sqrt{33}} + 1}{3} \in (1, 2)$ is the real root of $q(x) = x^3 - x^2 - x - 1$ Since $p(\beta) = \beta^3 - \beta^2 - 3 = \beta^2 + \beta + 1 - \beta^2 - 3 = \beta - 2 < 0$, we have $\beta < \alpha < 2$.

For almost any infinite words w on the alphabet $A = \{0, 1\}$ without the factor 111 we have $p_w(n) = T_{n+2}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that we have proved that for this example, we have

$$E_W(f) = \log \beta < \log \alpha = E_0(f).$$

6 The $\frac{1}{2}$-Theorems

Despite of these examples, we will show that if a function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$, then the ratio $E_W(f)/E_0(f)$ is always bigger than $\frac{1}{2}$ (Theorem 6.2) and that the constant $\frac{1}{2}$ can not be improved (Theorem 6.7).

6.1 The ratio $E_W(f)/E_0(f)$ is bigger than $\frac{1}{2}$

We begin by proving the following elementary Lemma :

Lemma 6.1. *If k is a fixed positive integer and $\beta > 1$ a solution of $\beta^{k+1} = \beta^k + 1$, then*

i) for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\beta^{k+r} > r + 1$;

ii) for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $k + 1 + r(r + 3)/2 < \beta^{2(k+r)}$.

Proof. We have $\beta^k > 1$ and, if we suppose that $\beta^{k+r} > r + 1$, it follows that $\beta^{k+r+1} = \beta^{k+r} + \beta^r > (r + 1) + 1$, which proves i) by induction on r.

Then we can easily prove ii) by induction on r. When $r = 0$, the assertion follows from i) applied to $r = k$ and, if we suppose that $k + 1 + r(r + 3)/2 < \beta^{2(k+r)}$, it follows that $k + 1 + (r + 1)(r + 4)/2 = k + 1 + r(r + 3)/2 + r + 2 < \beta^{2(k+r)} + r + 2$. By i) we have $\beta^{2(k+r)} + r + 2 < \beta^{2(k+r)} + \beta^{k+r+1}$, so that it remains to show that $\beta^{2(k+r)} + \beta^{k+r+1} < \beta^{2(k+r+1)}$, i. e. that $\beta^{k+r} + \beta < \beta^{k+r+2} = \beta^{k+r+1} + \beta^{r+1} = \beta^{k+r} + \beta^r + \beta^{r+1}$, which follows from $\beta < 1 + \beta$ if $r = 0$ and $1 < \beta^{r-1} + \beta^r$ if $r \geq 1$.

□

Theorem 6.2. *If f is a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that $f(n) \geq \max\{n+1, \exp(E_0(f)n)\}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $E_W(f) > \frac{1}{2}E_0(f)$.*

Remark 6.3. In particular, it follows from Lemma 5.5 that Theorem 6.2 applies when f satisfies the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$.

Proof. We split the proof in three parts depending on the value of $E_0(f)$.

If $E_0(f) \geq \log 2$ and $m = \lfloor \exp(E_0(f)) \rfloor \geq 2$, it follows from our hypothesis that $f(n) \geq m^n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If w is a normal sequence on the alphabet $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, we have $p_w(n) = m^n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $w \in W(f)$ and thus

$$E_W(f) \geq E(w) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_w(n) = \log m > \frac{\log(m + 1)}{2} > \frac{E_0(f)}{2}.$$

If $\frac{1}{2}\log 3 \leq E_0(f) < \log 2$, it follows from our hypothesis that $f(n) \geq \max\{n+1, 3^{n/2}\} \geq F_{n+2}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $(F_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the Fibonacci sequence, defined in Part 5.3. For almost any infinite words w on the alphabet $A = \{0,1\}$ without the factor 11 we have $p_w(n) = F_{n+2}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that we have

$$E_W(f) \geq E(w) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n) = \log(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}) > \frac{1}{2}\log 2 > \frac{E_0(f)}{2}.$$

If $E_0(f) < \frac{1}{2}\log 3$, let us consider, for any positive integer k, the set $\Sigma_k = \{0, 10^k\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ (i. e. the set of infinite words over the alphabet $\{0,1\}$ such that two occurrencies of the letter 1 are always separated by at least k occurrencies of the letter 0).

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $L_k(n)$ be the set of the words of length n over the alphabet $\{0,1\}$ such that two occurrencies of the letter 1 are always separated by at least k occurrencies of the letter 0, and let $q_k(n) = |L_k(n)|$. For almost any $w \in \Sigma_k$ we have $p_w(n) = q_k(n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and it is not difficult to construct an infinite word $w = w^{(k)} \in \Sigma_k$ which satisfy these equalities: if we enumerate, for each $n \geq 1$, $L_k(n) = \{\alpha_1^{(n)}, \alpha_2^{(n)}, \ldots, \alpha_{q_k(n)}^{(n)}\}$, and take

$$w^{(k)} = \alpha_1^{(1)}0^k\alpha_2^{(1)}0^k\ldots\alpha_{q_k(1)}^{(1)}0^k\alpha_1^{(2)}0^k\alpha_2^{(2)}0^k\ldots 0^k\alpha_{q_k(2)}^{(2)}0^k\ldots\alpha_1^{(n)}0^k\alpha_2^{(n)}0^k\ldots 0^k\alpha_{q_k(n)}^{(n)}0^k\ldots.$$

then we have $p_w^{(k)}(n) = q_k(n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$L_k(n+k+1) = L_k(n+k)0 \cup L_k(n+k)1 = L_k(n+k)0 \cup L_k(n)0^k1,$$

which implies that, for any fixed positive integer k, the sequence $(q_k(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the following recurrence, valid for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$q_k(n+k+1) = q_k(n+k) + q_k(n).$$

Moreover the sequence $(q_k(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $q_k(n) = n+1$ for $0 \leq n \leq k+1$ (a word in $L_k(n)$ for $0 \leq n \leq k+1$ has at most one letter equal to 1). This implies in particular that, for $0 \leq r \leq k+1$, we have

$$q_k(k+r+1) = k+2+r(r+3)/2.$$

This also implies that there are two positive constants c_k and d_k such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $c_k.\beta_k^n < q_k(n) = p_{w^{(k)}}(n) < d_k.\beta_k^n$, where β_k is the largest real root of the polynomial $x^{k+1} - x^k - 1$.

Let us denote

$$\gamma_k = \max_{k+1 \leq n \leq 2(k+1)} \frac{\log q_k(n)}{n} = \max_{0 \leq r \leq k+1} \frac{\log(k+2+r(r+3)/2)}{k+r+1}$$

and remark that $\gamma_k = \max_{n \geq k+1} \frac{\log q_k(n)}{n}$. Indeed, if we write any integer $n \geq k+1$ as $n = b(k+1)+k+r+1$, with $b \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r \leq k+1$, we get $q_k(n) = q_k(b(k+1)+k+r+1) \leq (q_k(k+1))^b q_k(k+r+1) \leq \exp(b(k+1)\gamma_k)\exp((k+r+1)\gamma_k) = \exp(\gamma_k n)$.

It follows that for any integer $k \geq 1$, we have $\log \beta_k \leq \gamma_k$ and it follows from Lemma 6.1 ii) applied to $\beta = \beta_k$ that, for any integer $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\gamma_{k-1} = \max_{0 \leq r \leq k} \frac{\log(k+1+r(r+3)/2)}{k+r} < 2\log \beta_k.$$

This is enough to finish the proof. Indeed, for any integer $n \geq k+1$, we have $L_k(n) \subset L_{k-1}(n)$, so that $q_k(n) < q_{k-1}(n)$ and

$$\gamma_k = \max_{n \geq k+1} \frac{\log q_k(n)}{n} < \max_{n \geq k} \frac{\log q_{k-1}(n)}{n} = \gamma_{k-1}.$$

Since

$$\gamma_k = \max_{0 \leq r \leq k+1} \frac{\log(k+2+r(r+3)/2)}{k+r+1} < \frac{\log(k+2+(k+1)(k+4)/2)}{k+1},$$

we have $\lim_{n \to +\infty} \gamma_k = 0$. Now, as $E_0(f) < \frac{1}{2}\log 3$ and $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}\log 3$, let $k_0 \geq 2$ be such that $\gamma_{k_0} \leq E_0(f) < \gamma_{k_0-1}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$f(n) \geq \max\{n+1, \exp(E_0(f)n)\} \geq \max\{n+1, \exp(\gamma_{k_0} n)\} \geq q_{k_0}(n),$$

so that $w^{(k_0)} \in W(f)$, which implies

$$E_W(f) \geq \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{\log q_{k_0}(n)}{n} = \log \beta_{k_0} > \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{k_0-1} > E_0(f)/2.$$

□

The following corollary arises immediately from Theorem 4.7 (*iii*), Remark 5.4 and Theorem 6.2 (applied to $\tilde{\tilde{f}}$):

Corollary 6.4. *If f is a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that $f(n) \geq n+1$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $E_0(f) > 0$, then $\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(|\mathcal{L}_n(f)|) > 0$.*

6.2 Renormalization of pre-sturmian infinite words of order k

Lemma 6.5. *If a and b are words on the alphabet $\{0,1\}$ with distinct first letters and $|a| \geq |b|$, s is a positive integer and w is a non ultimately periodic word that belongs to $\{a, ba^s\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $p_w(k) = k+1$ and $(s+1)|a| + |b| \leq k$ then, if we consider w as an infinite word on the two letters alphabet $\{A, B\}$ with $A = a$ and $B = ba^s$, the words AA and BB cannot be both factors of w (except in the first positions). More precisely, if $w = \gamma_1\gamma_2\ldots$ with $\gamma_k \in \{A, B\}, \forall k \geq 1$, then there are no indexes i, j with $1 < i < j$, $\gamma_i = \gamma_{i+1} = B$ and $\gamma_j = \gamma_{j+1} = A$.*

Proof. If we put $r = (s+1)|a| + |b| \leq k$, we have $p_w(r) = r+1$, so that w has only one special factor of length $r-1$. Let us show that the words aba^s and $baa^s = ba^{s+1}$ (of size r) cannot be both special factors of w. If the words aba^s and ba^{s+1} were both special factors, then (we denote by T the one-sided shift map which deletes the first letter of a sequence) the words $T(a)ba^s$ and $T(b)a^{s+1}$ (of size $r-1$) would also be special factors of w, and thus $T(a)ba^s = T(b)a^{s+1}$, which would imply $T(ab) = T(a)b = T(b)a = T(ba)$. This would be a contradiction, since the first letters of a and b are different, and the total number of 0's (and 1's) in ab is equal to that in ba, so the total number of 0's in $T(ab)$ is different from that in $T(ba)$.

Let us remark that a factor ba^s that is not in the beginning of w is necessarily preceded by a factor a (since ba^s ends by a). Consider now the two possible cases:

1) if aba^s is not a special factor, then

- if aba^s cannot be followed by ba^s, the factor ba^sba^s cannot appear (except in the first positions), which implies that BB is not a factor of $w \in \{A, B\}^{\mathbb{N}}$;
- if aba^s cannot be followed by a, it is necessarily followed by ba^s, so that w would end by $ba^sba^sba^s\ldots$, which would contradict the non ultimate periodicity of w.

2) if aba^s is a special factor, then $ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$ is not a special factor, and thus

- if $ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$ cannot be followed by a, some iterate of w under the shift T (after the first ba) cannot have two consecutive factors a, which implies that AA is not a factor of $w \in \{A, B\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ (except in the first positions);
- if $ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$ cannot be followed by ba^s, it is necessarily followed by a. Let u be the word formed by the $|ba^s| = s|a| + |b|$ last letters of a^{s+1}. If $u \neq ba^s$, since ba^s is a special factor, u cannot be a special factor, so w would be necessarily followed by a, and thus w,

after the first occurrence of $ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$, would end by $aaaa\dots$, which would contradict the non ultimate periodicity of w. Therefore we should have $u = ba^s$, but this would imply that $ba^{s+2} = ba^{s+1}a$ ends by $ca = ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$, which is necessarily followed by a, and thus, again, w would end by $aaaa\dots$ after the first occurrence of $ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$, which would also contradict the non ultimate periodicity of w. □

Theorem 6.6. *Any pre-sturmian infinite word $w \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of order k is renormalizable in the following way: there are two words a and b belonging to $\{0,1\}^*$ with distinct first letters and a positive integer s such that*

$$|a| \geq |b|, (s+1)|a| + |b| > k$$

and some iterate of w under the one-sided shift T belongs to $\{a, ba^s\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. We first notice that, since $p_w(2) = 3$, the words 00 and 11 cannot be both factors of w (otherwise w would be ultimately periodic). This implies that w is renormalizable with words 0 and 10 (if w does not contain the factor 11) or with words 1 and 01 (if w does not contain the factor 00).

Assume now that w is renormalizable with words a and ba^s with distinct first letters and $(s+1)|a|+|b|$ maximal. If we had $(s+1)|a|+|b| \leq k$, it would follow from Lemma 6.5 that, as before, some iterate of w would be renormalizable with words a and $ba^sa = ba^{s+1}$ or with words ba^s and $aba^s = a(ba^s)^1$, which would contradict in both cases the maximality of $(s+1)|a| + |b|$. □

6.3 The constant $\frac{1}{2}$ is optimal

The constant $\frac{1}{2}$ in Theorem 6.2 cannot be improved, as shows the following theorem:

Theorem 6.7. *For any $c > \frac{1}{2}$, there is a function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ such that $E_W(f) < c \cdot E_0(f)$.*

Remark 6.8. By the proof of Theorem 6.2 it follows that, if c is very close to $\frac{1}{2}$ in Theorem 6.7, then $E_0(f)$ is necessarily very close to 0.

Proof. Let k be a large positive integer, $\theta = \exp(\frac{\log k}{k})$ and define the function f by

$$f(n) = \max\{n+1, \theta^n\}.$$

We have $E_0(f) = \log\theta = \frac{\log k}{k}$ and our goal is to give, for any $w \in W(f)$, an upper bound for $E(w) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log p_w(n)$. As ultimately periodic infinite words have zero entropy, we can restrict ourselves to non ultimately periodic infinite word $w \in W(f)$. Such infinite words are pre-sturmian of order k (we have $p_w(k) \leq f(k) = k+1$), so that if follows from Theorem 6.6 that w is renormalizable with words $A = a$ and $B = ba^s$ with different first letters, $|a| \geq |b|$ and $(s+1)|a| + |b| > k$. Any factor of length n of $w \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ can be covered by a factor of length at most $\lceil \frac{n}{|a|} \rceil + 1$ in the representation of w as an infinite word on the alphabet $\{A, B\}$. As there are at most $2^{|a|+|b|-1}$ possible choices for the words A and B, it follows that $p_w(n) \leq 2^{|a|+|b|+\lceil \frac{n}{|a|} \rceil}$ and

$$E(w) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{\log p_w(n)}{n} \leq \frac{1}{|a|}\log 2.$$

It follows in particular that, if $E(w) \geq \frac{1}{2}\log\theta = \frac{\log k}{2k}$, then $|a| < \frac{2k\log 2}{\log k}$ and, since $(s+2)|a| \geq (s+1)|a| + |b| > k$, s should be large for k large.

The infinite word w can be written as

$$w = a^{s_0} b a^{s_1} \dots b a^{s_j} \dots, \tag{3}$$

with $s_0 \geq 0$ and $s_j \geq s$ for any integer $j \geq 1$. We will concentrate on the gaps of size less than $2k$ between two consecutive occurrencies of the first letter of the word b in the representation (3). Let ε be a small positive constant such that

$$\frac{2\log\log k}{\log k} \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4} \tag{4}$$

to be chosen later and denote

$$\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_p\} = \{s_j|a| + |b|, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \cap \{(1-\varepsilon)k, \dots, 2k-1\}.$$

For each $0 \leq r \leq \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$, let $X(r)$ be the set of the indices j with

$$(1 + (r-1)\varepsilon)k \leq r_j < (1 + r\varepsilon)k.$$

If we consider $h = \lfloor \frac{\varepsilon k}{|a|} \rfloor \leq \lfloor \varepsilon(s+2) \rfloor$, it follows from (4) that $h \leq \lfloor (s+2)/4 \rfloor \leq s/2$ so that, for any $j \in X(r)$, the word

$$e_1^{(j)} e_2^{(j)} \dots e_q^{(j)} = a^{2h} b a^{(r_j - |b|)/|a|} b a^{2h}$$

is a factor of w. If $t_r = \lfloor (1+(r+2)\varepsilon)k \rfloor$, we claim that the $\lceil \varepsilon k \rceil |X(r)| \leq |a|(h+1)|X(r)|$ factors of size t_r of w

$$e_i^{(j)} e_{i+1}^{(j)} \dots e_{t_r+i-1}^{(j)}, 1 \leq i \leq \lceil \varepsilon k \rceil, j \in X(r)$$

are distinct. Indeed

- if $j_1 < j_2$ and $e_i^{(j_1)} e_{i+1}^{(j_1)} \dots e_{t_r+i-1}^{(j_1)} = e_i^{(j_2)} e_{i+1}^{(j_2)} \dots e_{t_r+i-1}^{(j_2)}$, we would have $e_{(2h-1)|a|+r_{j_1}+1}^{(j_1)}$ equal to the first letter of b, while $e_{(2h-1)|a|+r_{j_1}+1}^{(j_2)}$ is equal to the first letter of a, which would be a contradiction.

- if $i < \ell$ and $e_i^{(j_1)} e_{i+1}^{(j_1)} \dots e_{t_r+i-1}^{(j_1)} = e_\ell^{(j_2)} e_{\ell+1}^{(j_2)} \dots e_{t_r+\ell-1}^{(j_2)}$, we would have $e_{n-\ell+i}^{(j_1)} = e_n^{(j_2)}$ for $\ell \leq n \leq t_r + \ell - 1$ and, since $e_m^{(j_l)} = e_{m+|a|}^{(j_l)}, l = 1, 2$ while $m + |a| < 2|a|h$, we would have $e_{2|a|h+1}^{(j_2)} = e_{2|a|h+1-\ell+i}^{(j_1)} = e_{2|a|h+1-\ell+i-|a|}^{(j_1)} = e_{2|a|h+1-|a|}^{(j_2)}$, which would lead to a contradiction, since $e_{2|a|h+1}^{(j_2)}$ is the first letter of b, and $e_{2|a|h+1-u}^{(j_2)}$ is the first letter of a, and they are distinct.

It follows that

$$\varepsilon k |X(r)| \leq \lceil \varepsilon k \rceil |X(r)| \leq p_w(t_r) \leq \theta^{t_r} \leq k^{1+(r+2)\varepsilon},$$

so that $|X(r)| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{(r+2)\varepsilon}$.

For a and b fixed, let us consider now, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the number y_n of factors of length n of w of the form $v_1 v_2 \dots v_m$ with, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $v_j \in \{a, b\}$ and such that $v_m = b$. For k large enough, it follows from (4) that $\varepsilon \geq \frac{2 \log \log k}{\log k} \geq \frac{2 \log 2}{\log k}$, so that

$$(1-\varepsilon)k \leq (1 - \frac{2 \log 2}{\log k})k \leq k - |a| < s|a| + |b|$$

and

$$\inf_{j \geq 1} |ba^{s_j}| \geq (1-\varepsilon)k.$$

It follows that for any integer $n \geq 2k$, we have

$$y_n \leq \sum_{j=1}^{p} y_{n-r_j} + \sum_{j=2k}^{n} y_{n-j},$$

so that

$$\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log y_n \leq \log \hat{\lambda},$$

where $\hat{\lambda} > 1$ satisfies the equation

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \hat{\lambda}^{-r_j} + \sum_{j=2k}^{\infty} \hat{\lambda}^{-j} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \hat{\lambda}^{-r_j} + \frac{\hat{\lambda}^{-2k}}{1-\hat{\lambda}^{-1}},$$

which implies

$$1 \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil} |X(r)| \hat{\lambda}^{-(1+(r-1)\varepsilon)k} + \frac{\hat{\lambda}^{-2k}}{1-\hat{\lambda}^{-1}} \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{(r+2)\varepsilon} \hat{\lambda}^{-(1+(r-1)\varepsilon)k} + \frac{\hat{\lambda}^{-2k}}{1-\hat{\lambda}^{-1}}.$$

It follows from (4) that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\log k}{2 \log\log k} = e^{(\log\log k - \log\log\log k - \log 2)} \leq e^{(\log\log k)} = k^{\frac{\log\log k}{\log k}} \leq k^{\varepsilon/2}$$

so that, writing $\hat{\lambda} = e^{\sigma \log(k)/k}$ with $\sigma > 0$, we have

$$1 \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{(r+2)\varepsilon} k^{-(1+(r-1)\varepsilon)\sigma} + \frac{k^{-2\sigma}}{1-e^{-\sigma \log(k)/k}} = O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{-\sigma+\varepsilon(2+\sigma)} k^{\varepsilon \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil (1-\sigma)} + \frac{k^{1-2\sigma}}{\log(k)})$$

$= O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{1-2\sigma+3\varepsilon}) = O(k^{1-2\sigma+\frac{5}{2}\varepsilon})$, which implies that $\sigma < 1/2 + 2\varepsilon$, for k large.

If a factor of length n of w contains at least one occurrence of the word b, it is of the form $\beta_1 v_1 v_2 \ldots v_m \beta_2$ where β_1 is a strict suffix of a or b, $v_j \in \{a, b\}$ for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $v_m = b$ and β_2 a prefix of a^i for some $i \geq 0$. As there are $n - |b| + 1$ possible choices for the emplacement of the first letter of the word v_m, there are at most

$$2(n - |b| + 1) \sum_{n' \leq n} y_{n'}$$

such factors of length n. On the other hand, there are at most $2|a|^2$ factors of length n of w without any occurrence of the word b (there are the words of the the kind $\beta_1 a^m \beta_2$, where β_1 is a strict suffix of a or b and β_2 a strict prefix of a or b). Finally, as there are at most $2^{|a|+|b|-1}$ possible words a and b, we have

$$p_w(n) \leq 2^{|a|+|b|}((n - |b| + 1) \sum_{n' \leq n} y_{n'} + |a|^2)$$

and it follows that

$$E(w) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_n(w) = \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log y_n \leq \log \hat{\lambda} = \sigma \frac{\log k}{k} < (1/2 + 2\varepsilon) \frac{\log k}{k}.$$

If we choose now $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}(c - 1/2)$, where $c > 1/2$ is given in the statement, we have

$$E_W(f) = \sup_{w \in W(f)} E(w) < c\frac{\log k}{k},$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

7 Complexity functions of exponential order

We will show that for any $h \in (0, +\infty)$, there is an infinite word w such that p_w has exponential order h. More precisely:

Theorem 7.1. *There exists a non-increasing function $C : (0, +\infty) \to [1, +\infty)$ such that, for any given $h \in (0, +\infty)$, there is an infinite word w such that we have, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $e^{hn} \leq p_w(n) \leq C(h)e^{hn}$.*

Remark 7.2. It will follow from the proof of Theorem 7.1 that $C(h) \leq 4$ for $h \geq \log 2$. But the function $C(h)$ cannot be uniformly bounded. Indeed if we have, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $e^{hn} \leq p_w(n) \leq C(h)e^{hn}$, it follows (as w in not ultimately periodic) that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $n+1 \leq p_w(n) \leq C(h)e^{hn}$. By choosing $n = \lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor$, it follows that $C(h) \geq (n+1)e^{-hn} \geq \frac{1}{eh}$.

Proof. If $q = \lceil e^h \rceil$ and $A = \{0, 1, \ldots, q-1\}$, we denote by $\leq$ the lexicographic order on $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ (if $\alpha = a_1a_2a_3\ldots$ and $\alpha' = a'_1a'_2a'_3\ldots$, we put $\alpha \leq \alpha'$ if $\alpha = \alpha'$ or if there is an integer $n \geq 1$ such that $a_k = a'_k$ for any $k < n$ and $a_n < a'_n$). It follows from [Urb86] (or from [LM06]) that, for any $\alpha \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$, if we denote

$$W_\alpha = \{\theta \in A^{\mathbb{N}}; T^n(\theta) \leq \alpha, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\} = w(K_\alpha)$$

and $d(\alpha)$ the Hausdorff dimension of the set K_α, then $d(\alpha) = h_{top}(W_\alpha, T)/\log q$ coincides with the upper box dimension of K_α and depends continuously on α; moreover, the image of d is [0,1]. Take $\alpha(h)$ minimum such that $d(\alpha(h)) = h/\log q$ and notice that $\alpha(h)$ cannot end by 0^∞. For each integer $n \geq 1$, let $\Lambda_n(h) = \{\gamma_1^{(n)}, \gamma_2^{(n)}, \ldots, \gamma_{p(n)}^{(n)}\}$ be the set of all factors of size n of all words in $W_{\alpha(h)}$. We may choose positive integers $r_1^{(1)}, r_2^{(1)}, \ldots, r_{p(1)}^{(1)}, r_1^{(2)}, r_2^{(2)}, \ldots, r_1^{(3)}, r_2^{(3)}, \ldots, r_{p(3)}^{(3)}, \ldots$ such that the word

$$w = \gamma_1^{(1)}0^{r_1^{(1)}}\gamma_2^{(1)}0^{r_2^{(1)}}\ldots\gamma_{p(1)}^{(1)}0^{r_{p(1)}^{(1)}}\gamma_1^{(2)}0^{r_1^{(2)}}\gamma_2^{(2)}0^{r_2^{(2)}}\ldots\gamma_{p(2)}^{(2)}0^{r_{p(2)}^{(2)}}\gamma_1^{(3)}0^{r_1^{(3)}}\gamma_2^{(3)}0^{r_2^{(3)}}\ldots\gamma_{p(3)}^{(3)}0^{r_{p(3)}^{(3)}}\ldots$$

satisfies $L_n(w) = \Lambda_n(h)$ for any $n \geq 1$.

If $q = 2$, let $r \geq 1$ such that $\alpha(h) > 10^{r-1}10^\infty$ and consider the injective map g from $\Lambda_n(h)$ to A^{n+1} defined by

$$g(a_1 a_2 \dots a_n) = b_1 b_2 \dots b_{n+1},$$

where, for $i^* = \min\{i \mid a_j = 0, \forall j, i < j \leq n\}$, $b_{j+1} = a_j = 0$ for $i^* < j \leq n$, $b_{i^*+1} = a_{i^*}$, $b_{i^*} = 0$ and $b_j = a_j$ for $j < i^*$. (i.e. $g(a_1 \dots a_{i^*-1} a_{i^*} 0 \dots 0) = a_1 \dots a_{i^*-1} 0 a_{i^*} 0 \dots 0$).

Given $\gamma \in \Lambda_n(h)$ and $\gamma' \in \Lambda_{n'}(h)$, we have $g(\gamma)0^r\gamma' \in \Lambda_{n+n'+r+1}(h)$, so that for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we have

$$2^{r+1} p_w(n + n') \geq p_w(n + n' + r + 1) \geq p_w(n) p_w(n'),$$

and so $2^{-(r+1)} p_w(n+n') \geq (2^{-(r+1)} p_w(n))(2^{-(r+1)} p_w(n'))$. Lemma 1.1 applied to $a_n = \frac{2^{r+1}}{p_w(n)}$ implies that, for any positive integer n, we have

$$2^{-(r+1)} p_w(n) \leq \exp(n \lim_{n' \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n'} \log(2^{-(r+1)} p_w(n'))) = \exp(hn),$$

so that $e^{hn} \leq p_w(n) \leq 2^{r+1} e^{hn}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that, if $q = 2$, r is bounded if and only if h is bounded away from 0.

If $q \geq 3$, consider for $1 \leq r \leq q - 2$ the injective maps g_r from $\Lambda_n(h)$ to A^{n+1} defined by $g_r(0^n) = 0^{n+1}$ and, otherwise,

$$g_r(a_1 a_2 \dots a_n) = b_1 b_2 \dots b_{n+1},$$

where, for $i^* = \min\{i \mid a_j = 0, \forall j, i < j \leq n\}$, $b_{j+1} = a_j = 0$ for $i^* < j \leq n$, $b_{i^*+1} = r$, $b_{i^*} = a_{i^*} - 1$ and $b_j = a_j$ for $j < i^*$. Notice that the only point in the intersection of the images of two such maps is 0^n.

Given $\gamma \in \Lambda_n(h)$ and $\gamma' \in \Lambda_{n'}(h)$, we have $g_r(\gamma)\gamma' \in \Lambda_{n+n'+1}(h)$. This implies that, for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we have

$$q \cdot p_w(n + n') \geq p_w(n + n' + 1) \geq ((q - 2)p_w(n) - (q - 3))p_w(n'),$$

and, defining $\tilde{p}(n) = \frac{q-2}{q} p_w(n) - \frac{q-3}{q}$, we have for any $(n, n') \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $n \geq 2$

$$\tilde{p}(n + n') \geq \tilde{p}(n)\tilde{p}(n')$$

(by symmetry it also holds when $n' \geq 2$) so that, as before, we have for any integer $n \geq 2$

$$e^{hn} \leq p_w(n) = \frac{q}{q-2}\tilde{p}(n) + \frac{q-3}{q-2} \leq \frac{q}{q-2}e^{hn} + \frac{q-3}{q-2} \leq \frac{q+1}{q-2}e^{hn}.$$

Since we also have $p(1) = q \leq \frac{(q+1)(q-1)}{q-2} \leq \frac{q+1}{q-2}e^h$, we conclude that we have for any integer $n \geq 1$

$$e^{hn} \leq p_w(n) \leq \frac{q+1}{q-2}e^{hn} \leq 4e^{hn}.$$

□

The following corollary arises immediately from Theorem 7.1 by considering, for any $h \in (0, +\infty)$, the function defined by $f(n) = \max\{n+1, C(h)e^{hn}\}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

Corollary 7.3. *For any $h \in (0, +\infty)$, there exists a function f from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ of exponential order h satisfying conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ such that $E_0(f) = E_W(f) = h$.*

8 An open problem

It is easy to see that, for any functions f and g from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, we always have

$$E_W(\min\{f, g\}) \leq \min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\}.$$

But we were not able to answer the following question:

Problem 8.1. Is it true that, for any functions f and g from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ we have $E_W(\min\{f, g\}) = \min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\}$?

Proposition 8.2. *The following two propositions are equivalent :*

(P_1) for any functions f and g from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ we have $E_W(\min\{f, g\}) = \min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\}$;

(P_2) for any $h \in (0, +\infty)$, there is a function f_h satisfying the conditions $(\mathcal{C}*)$ with $E_W(f_h) = h$ such that for any function f with $E_W(f) \geq h$ we have $f(n) \geq f_h(n)$ for any positive integer n.

Moreover, if (P_1) or (P_2) is true, there is a word w for which $p_w(n) = f_h(n)$ for every positive integer n.

In order to prove Proposition 8.2, we begin by giving an effective version of Lemma 4.4 :

Lemma 8.3. *For any $c \in (0, \log q]$, we define the finctions $g_{(q,c)}$ and $f_{(q,c)}$ from $\mathbb{N}^*$ to $\mathbb{N}$ by*

$$g_{(q,c)}(n) = n \cdot \lceil \frac{n \log 2 + e^{cn}(1 + n(\log q - c))}{cn - \log(\lceil e^{cn} \rceil - 1)} \rceil$$

and

$$f_{(q,c)}(N) = \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} g_{(q,c)}(n).$$

Let $w \in \{0, 1, \ldots, q-1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be an infinite word such that $E(w) \geq c$. Then, for any positive integer N, there is a factor γ of w of size $f_{(q,c)}(N)$ such that, for every n with $1 \leq n \leq N$, the prefix of lenght $g_{(q,c)}(n)$ of γ contains at least $\lceil e^{cn} \rceil$ factors of size n.

Proof. Consider $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $w(x) = w$ and X the closure of the orbit of x by ψ, the shift map on $[0, 1]$ defined in Part 4.1. It is a compact set invariant by ψ, which has box dimension at least $c/\log q$.

Fix an integer n with $1 \leq n \leq N$. The number of words γ of size $g_{(q,c)}(n)$ with less than $\lceil e^{cn} \rceil$ factors of size n is at most

$$\binom{q^n}{\lceil e^{cn} \rceil - 1} (\lceil e^{cn} \rceil - 1)^{g_{(q,c)}(n)/n} \leq \left(\frac{e \cdot q^n}{e^{cn}} \right)^{e^{cn}} (\lceil e^{cn} \rceil - 1)^{g_{(q,c)}(n)/n}.$$

Multiplying this estimate by $(1/q^{g_{(q,c)}(n)})^{c/\log q} = e^{-cg_{(q,c)}(n)}$, we get

$$\left(\frac{e \cdot q^n}{e^{cn}} \right)^{e^{cn}} (\lceil e^{cn} \rceil - 1)^{g_{(q,c)}(n)/n} e^{-cg_{(q,c)}(n)} =$$

$$= \exp\left((1 + n(\log q - c))e^{cn} - \frac{g_{(q,c)}(n)}{n}(cn - \log(\lceil e^{cn} \rceil - 1)) \right) \leq$$

$$\leq \exp\left((1 + n(\log q - c))e^{cn} - (n \log 2 + e^{cn}(1 + n(\log q - c))) \right) = \exp(-n \log 2) = \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

If for any factor γ of size $f_{(q,c)}(N)$ of w there was an integer n with $1 \leq n \leq N$ such that the prefix of length $g_{(q,c)}(n)$ of γ, contains less than $\lceil c^n \rceil$ factors of size n, it would be possible to cover X by a finite number of block intervals with disjoint interiors $I_j, 1 \leq j \leq m$ of sizes $1/q^{r_j}, 1 \leq j \leq m$ with

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} (1/q^{r_j})^{c/\log q} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} k_n e^{-cg_{(q,c)}(n)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2^n} < 1$$

and this, as in lemma 4.2, would imply that the limit capacity of X is strictly smaller than $c/\log q$ which would be a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 8.4. We may adapt the above proof in order to show the following variation of the previous proposition: in the same setting, define the finction $\tilde{f}_{(q,c)}$ from $\mathbb{N}^*$ to $\mathbb{N}$ by

$$\tilde{f}_{(q,c)}(n) = n \cdot \lceil \frac{n \log 2 + e^{cn}(1 + n(\log q - c))}{\log 2} \rceil$$

and consider $w \in \{0, 1, \ldots, q-1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ an infinite word such that $E(w) \geq c$. Then, for any positive integer N, there is a factor γ of size $\tilde{f}_{(q,c)}(N)$ of w such that, for any integer n with $1 \leq n \leq N$, the prefix of length $\tilde{f}_{(q,c)}(n)$ of γ contains at least $\lceil \frac{e^{cn}}{2} \rceil$ factors of size n. The conclusion of this statement is slightly weaker, but the function $\tilde{f}_{(q,c)}$ (which depends continuously on c) is more regular than $g_{(q,c)}$, which is not even locally bounded on c if $e^{cn} \in \mathbb{N}$.

We can now prove Proposition 8.2:

Let us first prove that (P_2) implies (P_1): if $\min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\} = h$, we have $E_W(f) \geq h$ and $E_W(g) \geq h$, so that we have $f(n) \geq f_h(n)$ and $g(n) \geq f_h(n)$ for any positive integer n, and thus $\min\{f, g\}(n) \geq f_h(n)$ for any positive integer n. In particular, we have

$$E_W(\min\{f, g\}) \geq E_W(f_h) = h = \min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\}.$$

Since $E_W(\min\{f, g\}) \leq \min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\}$, we have $E_W(\min\{f, g\}) = \min\{E_W(f), E_W(g)\}$.

In order to prove that (P_1) implies (P_2), let us define the function f_h by

$$f_h(n) = \min\{p_w(n) | E(w) \geq h\}.$$

Given a positive integer n, let w_n be an infinite word such that $E(w_n) \geq h$ and $p_{w_n}(n) = f_h(n)$ and let $g_k = p_{w_k}$ for $k \geq 1$. If (P_1) is true, an easy induction gives

$$E_W(\min\{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_m\}) = \min\{E_W(g_1), E_W(g_2), \ldots, E_W(g_m)\} \geq h.$$

So there is an infinite word $\tilde{w}_m \in W(\min\{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_m\})$ with $E(\tilde{w}_m) \geq h$. Since $q_m = \min\{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_m\}(1)$ is eventually constant, we can assume without loss of generality that it is constant, equal to q. Then Lemma 8.3 implies that there is a factor γ_m of size $f_{(q,h)}(m)$ of $\tilde{w}_m$ such that, for any integer n with $1 \leq n \leq m$, the prefix of length $g_{(q,h)}(n)$

of γ_m contains at least $\lceil e^{hn} \rceil$ factors of size n. Let $\hat{w}_m$ be an iterate of $\tilde{w}_m$ which begins by the factor γ_m. Then, by compacity, there is a subsequence of $(\hat{w}_m)_{m\geq 1}$ converging to an infinite word $\hat{w}$ and, for every positive integer n, the factor of length $g_{(q,h)}(n)$ of $\hat{w}$ contains at least $\lceil e^{hn} \rceil$ factors of size n. In particular we have $E(\hat{w}) \geq h$, so that we have

$$\lceil e^{hm} \rceil \leq p_{\hat{w}}(m) \leq g_m(m) = f_h(m).$$

On the other hand, given a function f with $E_W(f) \geq h$, since there is $w \in W(f)$ with $E(w) = E_W(f) \geq h$, we have $f(n) \geq p_w(n) \geq f_h(n)$ for any positive integer n. In particular, since $E_W(p_{\hat{w}}) \geq h$, we have

$$p_{\hat{w}}(n) \geq f_h(n)$$

for any positive integer n, so that $p_{\hat{w}}(n) = f_h(n)$ for any positive integer n. Now it follows from Theorem 7.1 that for any positive integer m we have $f_h(m) \leq C(h)e^{hm}$, so that we have $E_W(f_h) = h$.

References

[Bor09] E. Borel, Les probabilités dénombrables et leurs applications arithmétiques, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, 27 (1909), pp. 247271.

[Bug04] Y. Bugeaud, Approximation by algebraic numbers, *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 160, Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 2004.

[Cas94] J. Cassaigne, Motifs évitables et régularité dans les mots, *Thèse de Doctorat*, université Paris 6 (1994), rapport LITP TH94-04.

[Cas96] J. Cassaigne, Special factors of sequences with linear subword complexity, In *Developments in language theory, II (Magdeburg, 1995)*, 25-34. Word Sci. Publishing, 1996.

[Cas97] J. Cassaigne, Complexité et facteurs spéciaux, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin*, 4(1): 67-88, 1997.

[CH73] E.M. Coven and G.A. Hedlund, Sequences with minimal block growth, *Math. Systems Theory* 7 (1973), 138-153.

[Fal90] K. J. Falconer, Fractal geometry. mathematical foundations and applications John Wiley & Sons, Chichester 1990.

[Fek23] M. Fekete, Uber der Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 17 (1923), 228-249.

[Gri73] C. Grillenberger, Construction of strictly ergodic systems I. Given entropy, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Geb.*, 25: 323-334, 1973.

[HM38] G. A. Hedlund and M. Morse, Symbolics dynamics, *Amer. J. Math.*, 60 (1938), 815-866.

[HM40] G. A. Hedlund and M. Morse, Symbolics dynamics II. Sturmian trajectories, *Amer. J. Math.*,62 (1940), 1-42.

[LM06] R. Labarca and C. G. Moreira, Essential dynamics for Lorenz maps on the real line and the Lexicographical World, *Ann. I. H. Poincar - Anal. Non Lin.*, 23: 683-694, 2006.

[Kůr03] P. Kůrka, Topological and symbolics dynamics, *Cours spécialisés SMF*,volume 11, 2003.

[Lot02] M. Lothaire, Algebraic combinatorics on words, volume 90 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[MM10] C. Mauduit and C. G. Moreira, Complexity of infinite sequences with zero entropy, *Acta Arithmetica* 142 (2010), 331-346.

[MM12] C. Mauduit and C. G. Moreira, Generalized Hausdorff dimensions of sets of real numbers with zero entropy expansion, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* 32 (2012), 1073-1089.

[MS97] C. Mauduit and A. Sárközy, On finite binary pseudorandom sequences. I. Measure of pseudorandomness, the Legendre symbol. *Acta Arithmetica* 82 (1997), 365-377.

[MS98] C. Mauduit and A. Sárközy, On finite binary pseudorandom sequences. II. The Champernowne, Rudin-Shapiro and Thue-Morse sequence, a further construction. *J. Number Theory* 73 (2) (1998), 256-276.

[PF02] N. Pytheas Fogg. Substitutions in dynamics, arithmetics and combinatorics, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1794*, Springer, 2002. Edited by V. Berthé, S. Ferenczi, C. Mauduit and A. Siegel.

[PT92] J. Palis and F. Takens, *Hyperbolicity and sensitive chaotic dynamics at homolinic bifurcations : fractal dimensions and infinitely many attractors*, Cambridge Univ. Press, (1992).

[Que87] M. Queffélec, Substitution dynamical systems — spectral analysis, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1294*, Springer, 1987.

[Urb86] M. Urbański, On Hausdorff dimension of invariant sets for expanding maps of a circle, *Ergodic Th, & Dynam. Sys.* 6: 295-309, 1986.